

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed June 30, 2005 in the present application, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-15 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 7 and 12 are independent.

In this Response, Applicants' silence with regard to the Examiner's rejections of dependent claims constitutes a recognition by the Applicants that the rejections are moot based on the Remarks relative to the independent claim from which the dependent claims depend. Applicants reserve the option to further prosecute the same or similar claims in the instant or a subsequent application.

Claim Rejections

In the Office Action mailed June 10, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-7, 10-12, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Straforini et al.* (U.S. 6,092,059).

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 3, 8, 9 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Straforini et al.* in view of *Rangachar* (U.S. 5,495,521).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Independent claim 1 recites a method, comprising generating classification outputs from a first data classifier based on first data elements and using the classification outputs and the first data elements to generate rules relating the first data elements and the classification outputs.

Independent claim 7 recites a system, comprising a first data classifier configured to generate, based on first data elements, classification outputs, and a rule inducer configured to use the first data elements and the classification outputs to generate rules relating the first data elements and the classification outputs.

Independent claim 12 recites a processor program for classifying data, the processor program disposed on a processor-readable medium and comprising instructions to cause a processor to generate classification outputs based on first data elements provided to a first

data classifier and to generate rules relating the first data elements and the classification outputs, based on the first data elements and the classification outputs.

Straforini et al. describe a hierarchical classification system based on a hierarchy of classifiers for real time inspection and classification. As best seen in Figure 3, the classifier 10 has a first rule based sub-classifier 54 which first attempts to classify objects. This classification is conducted at a fairly broad brush level. Those objects that are not classified are then provided to a training based sub-classifier 56. This training based sub-classifier 56 may be implemented by, for example, a neural network. Of those objects that the training based sub-classifier 56 is able to classify, a second rule based sub-classifier 58 attempts to provide a refinement to those classifications provided by the training based sub-classifier 56. Of those objects unable to be classified by the training based sub-classifier 56, a third rule based sub-classifier attempts to classify the objects.

Nowhere in *Straforini et al.*, and in particular in the sections referred to by the Examiner, is there a description of a method, system or processor program as recited in independent claims 1, 7 and 12, respectively. In particular, *Straforini et al.* do not disclose a method of generating classification outputs from a first data classifier based on first data elements and using the classification outputs and the first data elements to generate rules relating the first data elements and the classification outputs. Rule generation is simply not present in *Straforini et al.* Accordingly, *Straforini et al.* does not anticipate independent claim 1. The system and processor program recited in respective independent claims 7 and 12 include, at the least, rule generation features similar to that recited in claim 1. Accordingly, *Straforini et al.* does not anticipate independent claims 7 and 12. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 7 and 12 are patentable over *Straforini et al.* and are in condition for allowance.

With respect to claims 2, 3, 8, 9 and 13, the Examiner refers to a passage in *Rangachar* which indicates that fraudulent phone calls are a major source of revenue loss to telephone service providers and thus provides a justification for combining the two references. However, Applicants fail to see how this provides sufficient justification to combine the references. In any case, *Rangachar* also does not relate to rule generation. Thus, the rejection of claims 2, 3, 8, 9 and 13 as being unpatentable over *Straforini et al.* in

view of *Rangachar* is moot since the combination still does not disclose the features defined in the independent claims. Neither *Straforini et al.* nor *Rangachar* teach or suggest generating rules relating the first elements and the classification outputs. Each of the dependent claims 2-6, 8-11 and 13-15 are patentable over *Straforini et al.* in view of *Rangachar*, at least by dependency, and are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert W. Gauthier, Reg. No. 35,153
Attorney for Applicants
Tel. No. (617) 832-1175
Fax. No. (617) 832-7000

Date: November 29, 2005
Customer No: 25181
Patent Group
Foley Hoag, LLP
155 Seaport Blvd.
Boston, MA 02210-2600